



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,141	09/11/2003	Sebastien Perrot	PF030065	4968
24498	7590	11/26/2008		
Joseph J. Laks Thomson Licensing LLC 2 Independence Way, Patent Operations PO Box 5312 PRINCETON, NJ 08543			EXAMINER	
			ADDY, ANTHONY S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
11/26/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/660,141	Applicant(s) PERROT ET AL.
	Examiner ANTHONY S. ADDY	Art Unit 2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on August 04, 2008.

Claims 1-9 are pending in the present application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on August 04, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that, "Nowhere does Meier show or suggest a network comprising only one access point device other than the bridge device, said access point being adapted to manage the centralized wireless network (see page 2, sixth paragraph of the response)," examiner respectfully disagrees and maintains that Meier teaches and meets the limitations as claimed. Examiner reiterates that Meier teaches a bridge device (WDAP_s 441) for connecting a centralized wireless network (*OWL radio network 421*) to a plurality of other networks (*subnets 401 and 403*) (see col. 10, lines 17-30, col. 20, lines 28-34, col. 24, lines 29-41, col. 25, lines 8-10 and Fig. 9; shows a wireless domain access point (WDAP_s 441) [i.e., *reads on a bridge device for connecting a centralized wireless network 421 to a plurality of other wired networks 401 & 403*]], said centralized wireless network comprising: only one an access point device (WDAP_P 425), other than the bridge device, said access point being adapted to manage the centralized wireless network and to associate with a wireless device to allow said wireless device to be a member of the centralized wireless network and to allow said wireless device to communicate with other members of the centralized

wireless network (see col. 24, line 31 through col. 26, line 25 and Fig. 9; shows a centralized wireless network 421 comprising a primary wireless domain access point (WDAP_P 425)). Examiner agrees with applicant's remarks that Meier shows access points WMAP 431,433 and 435 in OWL radio network 421, but reiterates that access points WMAP 431,433 and 435 **are not adapted to manage** the centralized wireless network, since Meier clearly teaches the primary wireless domain access point (WDAP_P 425) is the **root node** of the OWL radio network 421 (see col. 10, lines 10-15, and col. 25, lines 38-40), hence the OWL radio network 421 has **only one** access point device (i.e. **primary wireless domain access point (WDAP_P 425)**) other than the bridge device (i.e. WDAP_S 441), **adapted to manage** the centralized wireless network (i.e. OWL radio network 421), hence the rejections using Meier are proper and maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Meier, U.S. Patent Number 6,400,702 (hereinafter Meier).**

Regarding claim 1, Meier teaches a bridge device (WDAP_S 441) for connecting a centralized wireless network (*OWL radio network 421*) to a plurality of other networks (*subnets 401 and 403*) (see col. 10, lines 17-30, col. 20, lines 28-34, col. 24, lines 29-41, col. 25, lines 8-10 and Fig. 9; shows a wireless domain access point (WDAP_S 441) [i.e. reads on a bridge device for connecting a centralized wireless network 421 to a

plurality of other wired networks 401 & 403]), each of said other networks having devices which can communicate with each other (see col. 22, lines 50-55 and col. 26, lines 20-25), said centralized wireless network comprising: only one an access point device (WDAP_P 425), other than the bridge device, said access point device being adapted to manage the centralized wireless network and to associate with a wireless device to allow said wireless device to be a member of the centralized wireless network and to allow said wireless device to communicate with other members of the centralized wireless network (see col. 24, line 31 through col. 26, line 25 and Fig. 9; shows a centralized wireless network 421 comprising a primary wireless domain access point (WDAP_P 425)), said bridge device (WDAP_S 441) comprising a bridge module for managing a plurality of ports for connecting to respective other networks (see col. 10, lines 17-30, col. 20, lines 28-34, col. 24, lines 29-41 and col. 25, lines 8-10); wherein said bridge device comprises a link management module for managing associations with said access point of devices of networks connected to the bridge device other than the centralized wireless network (see col. 22, lines 29-35, col. 23, lines 23-29 and col. 24, lines 29-41 [i.e. the spanning tree protocol contained at the bridge device (WDAP_S 441) reads on a link management module, since the spanning tree protocol is known in the art as a link management protocol and is specifically implemented in the bridging device (WDAP_S 441) for monitoring communication traffic flow related to associations and disassociations of communication terminals in the centralized wireless network 421 and the wired networks 401 & 403]); and wherein the bridge device (WDAP_S 441) is adapted to be associated to said access point (WDAP_P 425) of the centralized wireless

network (*OWL radio network 421*) (see col. 10, lines 17-30, col. 20, lines 28-34, col. 24, lines 29-41, col. 25, lines 8-10 and Fig. 9; shows a wireless domain access point (WDAP_S 441) [i.e. a bridge device] to be associated to said access point (WDAP_P 425) of centralized wireless network [i.e. *OWL radio network 421*]).

Regarding claim 2, Meier teaches all the limitations of claim 1. In addition, Meier further teaches a bridge device, further comprising means for determining a spanning tree for all networks attached to the device, comprising means for enabling or disabling the determination of the spanning tree (see col. 22, lines 29-35, col. 23, lines 23-29 and col. 24, lines 29-41).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
6. Claims 3-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Meier, U.S. Patent Number 6,400,702 (hereinafter Meier)** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Baker et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,570,366 (hereinafter Baker)**.

Regarding claim 3, Meier teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Meier fails to explicitly teach means for updating filtering tables for respective connected networks, said filtering tables comprising information for determining whether a message on a network is to be forwarded to another network or not, said updating using a process by default, comprising means for enabling or disabling the default process.

Baker, however, teaches a bridge-based access point comprising means for updating filtering tables for respective connected networks (see col. 4, line 52 through col. 5, line 32, col. 6, lines 35-44 and Figures 1, 2 and 8), said filtering tables comprising information for determining whether a message on a network is to be forwarded to another network or not, said updating using a process by default (see col. 4, line 52 through col. 5, line 32 and col. 6, lines 35-44), comprising means for enabling or disabling the default process (see col. 5, lines 19-26 and Figures 1, 2 and 8).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Meier with Baker to include means for updating filtering tables for respective connected networks, said filtering tables comprising information for determining whether a message on a network is to be forwarded to another network or not, said updating using a process by default, comprising means for enabling or disabling the default process, in order to efficiently transfer filtering information concerning a mobile terminal from one access point to another when the mobile terminal moves from the network of the one access point to the network of the another access point as per the teachings of Baker (see col. 2, lines 44-49).

Regarding claim 4, Meier in view of Baker teaches all the limitations of claim 3. Baker further teaches a bridge device, wherein said default process is based on analysis of source address in messages detected on a respective network, comprising means for enabling or disabling message detection based updating (see col. 4, line 52 through col. 5, line 32 and col. 6, lines 35-44 and Figures 5-6 and 8).

Regarding claim 5, Meier in view of Baker teaches all the limitations of claim 3. Baker further teaches a bridge device, further comprising means for updating a filtering table for a given network based on a device discovery process specific to said given network (see col. 4, line 52 through col. 5, line 32 and col. 6, lines 35-44 and Figures 2 and 8).

Regarding claim 6, Meier in view of Baker teaches all the limitations of claim 3. Baker further teaches a bridge device, wherein said default process is enabled for an Ethernet network (see col. 3, lines 57-61 and col. 5, lines 19-32).

Regarding claim 7, Meier in view of Baker teaches all the limitations of claim 3. Baker further teaches a bridge device, wherein said default process is disabled for a USB network (see col. 3, lines 57-61 and col. 5, lines 19-32 [i.e. the limitation "said default process is disabled for a USB network" is met by Baker, since Baker teaches the enabling and disabling of a wired network which broadly reads on a USB network]).

Regarding claim 8, Meier in view of Baker teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Baker further teaches a bridge device, further comprising means for generating a message to said link management module upon a filtering table amendment, said means for generating a message having an enabled state and a disabled state for each network (see col. 4, line 52 through col. 5, line 32 and col. 6, lines 35-44 and Figures 2 and 8).

Regarding claim 9, Meier in view of Baker teaches all the limitations of claim 8. Baker further teaches a bridge device, wherein said means for generating a message are enabled for an Ethernet network (see col. 3, lines 57-61 and col. 5, lines 19-32).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY S. ADDY whose telephone number is (571)272-7795. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 8:00am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Eisen can be reached on 571-272-7687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Anthony S Addy/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Alexander Eisen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617